

Response to Office Action mailed June 14, 2007  
Serial No. 10/516,574; filed July 13, 2005  
Inventor: Sang-Uk Kim  
Art Unit: 3682; Conf. No. 4962  
Page 19

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

**Attachments:** Two replacement drawing sheets labeled Replacement Sheet 4 / 18 and Replacement Sheet 5 / 18, respectively, are attached to the end of this document. The Replacement Sheets present amended drawings FIGS. 4 and 5.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 10, 12 - 20, and 22 - 34 have been amended to correct various informalities and present the claims with more specificity. No new claims have been added and no claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-34 are therefore pending. Claims 11 and 21 are withdrawn from consideration, whereby claims 1 - 10, 12 - 20, and 22 - 34 are presented for review. Favorable reconsideration and allowance are requested in light of the remarks, which follow.

### **1. Objection to the Drawings and Drawing Amendments**

The Examiner objects to the drawings for various inconsistencies between, e.g., FIGS. 4 and 5. FIG. 4 has been amended to change the numerical indication "152" to "162." FIG. 5 has been amended to label more of, e.g., the subassemblies of the spindle motor. The amendments to FIGS. 4 and 5 more clearly show (i) that the structures of Figs. 4 and 5 correspond to each other, and (ii) the various relationships between the subassemblies and individual components in the relevant drawings.

### **2. Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner objects to the disclosure based on various informalities related to the above-mentioned drawing objection. For example, the Examiner asserts that FIGS. 4 and 5 do not structurally correspond to each other. Consistent with the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments to FIGS. 4 and 5 resolve any such issues.

### **3. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement and asserts that the claims are not understandable. In a good faith effort to move this case to allowance, Applicant (i) amends claims 1 - 10, 12 - 20, and 22 - 34 to present the claims with more clarity and to remove various occurrences of offending language referred to in the Office Action dated 6/14/2007, and (ii) withdraws claims 11 and 21 from consideration. In so doing, Applicant obviates the rejection.

### **4. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Such rejection is largely analogous to the above-discussed

written description rejection. The clarifying amendments to claims 1 - 10, 12 - 20, and 22 - 34, and the withdrawal of claims 11 and 21, resolve any such issues.

## **5. Conclusions**

Claims 1 - 10, 12 - 20, and 22 - 34 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, and each defines patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that piecemeal examinations should be avoided, pursuant to, e.g., MPEP § 707.07(g). Correspondingly, should the Examiner issue a forthcoming Office Action rejecting claims based on prior art, such rejection(s) should be made non-final.

No fee is believed due with this communication. Nevertheless, should the Examiner consider any fees to be payable in conjunction with this or any future communication, the Director is authorized to direct payment of such fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy E. Newholm  
Registration No. 34,400

Dated: September 13, 2007

USPTO Customer No. 23,598  
Boyle Fredrickson, S.C.  
840 North Plankinton Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53203  
Telephone: (414) 225-9755  
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753  
Email: ten@boylefred.com